



255400

PHYSICAL DOCUMENT

LPS-n255400-v1

NOTICE OF VIOLATION AND INTENT TO FILE SUIT UNDER THE CWA

Author: Davila, Brittany

Document Type: LETTER

LSA(s):

Co-Counsel:

Counsel LSA(s):

Distribution List: Davila, Brittany (ENRD);Lattin, Sue (ENRD);Rose, Robert (ENRD);Reed, Jason (ENRD);True, Michael (ENRD);Goldsmith, Reese (ENRD)

Fileroom: LPS - Main Justice

DJ#:

Case Name:

Court:

Notes: SCANNED/UNASSIGNED

Double-Sided:

Received Date: 3/28/2017

Urgent:

Oversize:

Bound Document:

3804305

(34)

ENKID

UP



**LOS ANGELES
WATERKEEPER®**



**ORANGE COUNTY
COASTKEEPER®**

3151 Airway Avenue, Suite F-110
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Phone 714-850-1965
Fax 714-850-1592
www.coastkeeper.org



Inland Empire Waterkeeper

Advocacy • Education • Restoration • Enforcement

6876 Indiana Ave Suite D
Riverside, California 92506
Office 951.530.8823
Fax 951.530.8824
www.iewaterkeeper.org

17 MAR 28 PM 1:14

DEPT. OF JUSTICE - ENRD
ENVIRONMENT DIVISION

March 13, 2017

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Cemex Construction Materials Pacific LLC
Attn: Managing Agent
16161 Construction Circle East
Irvine, California 92614

VIA U.S. MAIL

CORPORATE CREATIONS NETWORK INC.
Registered Agent for Service of Process for
Cemex Construction Materials Pacific LLC
1430 Truxtun Avenue, 5th Floor
Bakersfield, California 93301

Re: Notice of Violation and Intent to File Suit Under the Clean Water Act

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing on behalf of Los Angeles Waterkeeper, Orange County Coastkeeper, and Inland Empire Waterkeeper (collectively "Waterkeeper") regarding violations of the Clean Water Act¹ and California's Industrial Storm Water Permit² ("Storm Water Permit") occurring at: 16161 Construction Circle East, Irvine, California 92614 ("Facility"). The purpose of this letter is to put Cemex Construction Materials Pacific LLC ("Cemex") as the owner(s) and operator(s) of the Facility, on notice of the violations of the Storm Water Permit occurring at the Facility, including, but not limited to, discharges of polluted storm water from the Facility into local surface waters. Violations of the Storm Water Permit are violations of the Clean Water Act. As explained below, Cemex is liable for violations of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act.

Section 505(b) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(b), requires that sixty (60) days prior to the initiation of a civil action under Section 505(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a), a citizen must give notice of his/her intention to file suit. Notice must be given to the

¹ Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251 et seq.

² National Pollution Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") General Permit No. CAS000001, Water Quality Order No. 92-12-DWQ, Order No. 97-03-DWQ, as amended by Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ.

17 MAR 28 PM 1:14

alleged violator, the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), the Regional Administrator of the EPA, the Executive Officer of the water pollution control agency in the State in which the violations occur, and, if the alleged violator is a corporation, the registered agent of the corporation. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 135.2(a)(1). This letter is being sent to you as the responsible owner and operator of the Facility or as the registered agent for this entity. This notice letter ("Notice Letter") is issued pursuant to 33 U.S.C. §§ 1365(a) and (b) of the Clean Water Act to inform Cemex that Waterkeeper intends to file a federal enforcement action against Cemex for violations of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act sixty (60) days or soon thereafter from the date of this Notice Letter.

Cemex is also the owner and/or operator of two additional ready-mix facilities that Waterkeeper has put on notice of similar Clean Water Act violations. These facilities are located at: 2722 N. Alameda Street Compton, California 90222 and 13220 Santa Ana Avenue, Fontana, California 92337.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Los Angeles Waterkeeper, Orange County Coastkeeper, and Inland Empire Waterkeeper

Los Angeles Waterkeeper is a non-profit 501(c)(3) public benefit corporation organized under the laws of California with its main office at 120 Broadway, Suite 105, Santa Monica, California 90401. Founded in 1993, Waterkeeper has approximately 3,000 members who live and/or recreate in and around the Los Angeles area.

Founded in 1999, Orange County Coastkeeper is a non-profit public benefit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California with its office at 3151 Airway Avenue, Suite F-110, Costa Mesa, California 92626. Inland Empire Waterkeeper's office is located at 6876 Indiana Avenue, Suite D, Riverside, California 92506. Inland Empire Waterkeeper is a program of Orange County Coastkeeper. Together, Inland Empire Waterkeeper and Orange County Coastkeeper have over 2,000 members who live and/or recreate in and around the Santa Ana River watershed.

Los Angeles Waterkeeper, Orange County Coastkeeper, and Inland Empire Waterkeeper, and are dedicated to the preservation, protection, and defense of the environment, wildlife, and natural resources of the Los Angeles, Orange County, and Inland Empire watersheds. To further these goals, these groups actively seek federal and state agency implementation of the Clean Water Act, and, where necessary, directly initiates enforcement actions on behalf of themselves and their members.

Members of Orange County Coastkeeper, Inland Empire Waterkeeper, and Los Angeles Waterkeeper enjoy the waters that the Facility discharges into, including Peters Canyon Channel, San Diego Creek, and Newport Bay. Members of Los Angeles Waterkeeper, Orange County Coastkeeper, and Inland Empire Waterkeeper use these waterways to swim, boat, kayak, bird

watch, view wildlife, hike, bike, walk, and run. Additionally, Members of Los Angeles Waterkeeper, Orange County Coastkeeper, and Inland Empire Waterkeeper use the waters to engage in scientific study through pollution and habitat monitoring and restoration activities. The discharge of pollutants from the Facility impairs each of these uses. Further, discharges of polluted storm water from the Facility are ongoing and continuous. Thus, the interests of Los Angeles Waterkeeper, Orange County Coastkeeper, and Inland Empire Waterkeeper's members have been, are being, and will continue to be adversely affected by Cemex's failure to comply with the Clean Water Act and the Storm Water Permit.

B. The Owners and/or Operators of the Facility

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that Cemex Construction Materials Pacific LLC is an owner and/or operator of the Facility since at least 1992. Cemex Construction Materials Pacific LLC is an active Delaware corporation registered to operate in California. Its registered agent for service of process is: Corporate Creations Network Inc., 1430 Truxtun Avenue, 5th Floor, Bakersfield, California 93301.

Waterkeeper refers to Cemex Construction Materials Pacific LLC as the "Facility Owner and/or Operator."

The Facility Owner and/or Operator has violated and continues to violate the procedural and substantive terms of the Storm Water Permit including, but not limited to, the illegal discharge of pollutants from the Facility into local surface waters. As explained herein, the Facility Owner and/or Operator is liable for violations of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act.

C. The Facility's Storm Water Permit Coverage

Certain classified facilities that discharge storm water associated with industrial activity are required to apply for coverage under the Storm Water Permit by submitting a Notice of Intent ("NOI") to the State Water Resources Control Board ("State Board") to obtain Storm Water Permit coverage. *See* Storm Water Permit, Finding #12. The Facility first obtained Storm Water Permit coverage on January 4, 1996. On August 31, 2015, Cemex submitted an NOI to continue Permit coverage at the Facility ("2015 NOI"). The 2015 NOI identifies the owner/operator of the Facility as "Cemex Construction Materials Pacific LLC" and the Facility name and location as "16161 Construction Cir E, Irvine CA 92614." The 2015 NOI lists the Facility as 2.1 acres in size and the percentage of imperviousness is not listed. The NOI lists the Waste Discharge Identification ("WDID") number for the Facility as 8 30I012077.

The NOI lists the Standard Industrial Classification ("SIC") code for the Facility as 3273 (ready-mixed concrete). SIC code 3273 facilities must obtain Storm Water Permit coverage for the entire facility. *See* Storm Water Permit, Attachment A, ¶ 2. Information available to Waterkeeper, including the Facility SWPPP describing vehicle and equipment maintenance and storage at the Facility, indicates that SIC code 4231 (terminal and joint terminal maintenance

facilities for motor freight transportation) and/or 4212 (local trucking without storage) also apply to the Facility.

D. Storm Water Pollution and the Waters Receiving Discharges from the Facility

With every significant rainfall event millions of gallons of polluted storm water originating from industrial operations such as the Facility pour into storm drains and local waterways. The consensus among agencies and water quality specialists is that storm water pollution accounts for more than half of the total pollution entering surface waters each year. Such discharges of pollutants from industrial facilities contribute to the impairment of downstream waters and aquatic dependent wildlife. As the Clean Water Act requires, these contaminated discharges can and must be controlled for the ecosystem to regain its health.

Polluted discharges from concrete mixing facilities such as the Facility contain pH affecting substances; metals, such as iron and aluminum; toxic metals, such as lead, zinc, cadmium, chromium, copper, arsenic, and mercury; chemical oxygen demand ("COD"); biological oxygen demand ("BOD"); total suspended solids ("TSS"); Nitrate Plus Nitrite ("N+N"); benzene; gasoline and diesel fuels; fuel additives; coolants; antifreeze; total kjehldahl nitrogen ("TKN"); trash; and oil and grease ("O&G"). Many of these pollutants are on the list of chemicals published by the State of California as known to cause cancer, birth defects, and/or developmental or reproductive harm. Health & Saf. Code §§ 25249.5-25249.1. Discharges of polluted storm water to the Santa Ana River pose carcinogenic and reproductive toxicity threats to the public and adversely affect the aquatic environment.

The Facility discharges into Peters Canyon Channel, which is a tributary of Reach 1 of San Diego Creek. Reach 1 of San Diego Creek flows into Upper Newport Bay which flows into Lower Newport Bay and ultimately the Pacific Ocean at the Newport Beach. Waterkeeper refers to these surface waters collectively as the "Receiving Waters." The Receiving Waters are ecologically sensitive areas. In particular, Upper Newport Bay is a protected ecological reserve consisting of 752-acres of salt marsh, mudflat, and marine habitats. Although pollution and habitat destruction have drastically diminished once-abundant and varied fisheries, these waters are still essential habitat for dozens of fish and bird species as well as invertebrate species, including at least two rare and/or threatened aquatic species. Storm water and non-storm water contaminated with sediment, heavy metals, and other pollutants harm the special biological significance of the Receiving Waters.

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region Regional Board ("Regional Board") issued the Basin Plan for the Santa Ana River Basin ("Basin Plan"). The Basin Plan identifies the "Beneficial Uses" of water bodies in the region. The intermittent Beneficial Uses for Peters Canyon Channel downstream of the point at which it receives storm water discharges from the Facility include: Groundwater Recharge (GWR); Water Contact Recreation, Non-contact Water Recreation, Warm Freshwater Habitat, and Wildlife Habitat. *See* Basin Plan at Table 3-1. The existing and potential Beneficial Uses of Reach 1 of San Diego

Creek are: Water Contact Recreation, Non-contact Water Recreation, Warm Freshwater Habitat, and Wildlife Habitat. *See* Basin Plan at Table 3-1. The existing and potential Beneficial Uses of Upper Newport Bay are: Water Contact Recreation, Non-contact Water Recreation, Commercial and Sportfishing, Preservation of Biological Habitats of Special Significance, Rare, Threatened or Endangered Species, Spawning, Reproduction and Development, Marine Habitat, Shellfish Harvesting, and Estuarine Habitat. *See* Basin Plan at Table 3-1. The existing and potential Beneficial Uses of Lower Newport Bay are: Water Contact Recreation, Non-contact Water Recreation, Commercial and Sportfishing, Wildlife Habitat, Rare, Threatened or Endangered Species, Spawning, Reproduction and Development, Marine Habitat, Shellfish Harvesting, and Navigation. *See* Basin Plan at Table 3-1.

According to the 2012 303(d) List of Impaired Water Bodies, Peters Canyon Channel is impaired for Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (“DDT”), Indicator Bacteria, Toxaphene, and pH. Reach 1 of the San Diego Creek is impaired for Fecal Coliform, Nutrients, Pesticides, Sedimentation/siltation, Selenium, and Toxaphene; Upper Newport Bay is impaired for Chlordane, Copper, DDT, Indicator Bacteria, Metals, Nutrients, Polychlorinated biphenyls (“PCBs”), Pesticides, Sediment Toxicity, and Sedimentation/Siltation; and Lower Newport Bay is impaired for Chlordane, Copper, DDT, Indicator Bacteria, Nutrients, PBCs, Pesticides, and Sediment toxicity.³ Polluted discharges from industrial sites, such as the Facility, contribute to the degradation of these already impaired surface waters and aquatic-dependent wildlife that depends on these waters.

II. THE FACILITY AND ASSOCIATED DISCHARGES OF POLLUTANTS

A. The Facility Site Description and Industrial Activities

The Facility is a concrete mixing facility that produces ready-mixed concrete. Concrete is produced by mixing aggregate (sand, gravel, or crushed stone), cement (a fine powder), fly ash, chemical additives, and water.

The areas of industrial activity at the Facility include a batch plant process area with cement and fly ash silos, admixture storage and handling areas, aggregate storage and handling areas with conveyors and stockpiles, process water areas, vehicle traffic and parking areas, vehicle fueling and truck parking areas, and a maintenance shop.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that the industrial activities at the Facility include but are not limited to: receiving raw materials from off site; concrete production; concrete truck loading; vehicle and equipment maintenance; storage of hazardous materials, such as diesel fuel, new vehicle fluids, and hazardous waste vehicle fluids; concrete truck parking; unloading of sand and gravel; storage of sand and gravel; storage of cement; storage of chemical additives; storage of fly ash and cement; weighing sand, gravel, cement, and lime; cement

³ 2012 Integrated Report, *available at*

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/tmdl/integrated2012.shtml (last accessed on February 22, 2017).

mixing; mixing appropriate amounts of sand, gravel, and cement; generation of process water; and generation of vehicle wash-water.

B. Pollutants and Pollutant Sources Related to the Facility Industrial Activities

The areas of industrial activity and industrial activities at the Facility are sources of pollutants. The pollutants associated with industrial activities at the Facility include, but are not limited to: pH affecting substances; metals, such as iron and aluminum; toxic metals, such as lead, zinc, cadmium, chromium, copper, arsenic, and mercury; COD; BOD; TSS; N+N; benzene; gasoline and diesel fuels; fuel additives; coolants; antifreeze; TKN; trash; and O&G.

Information available to Waterkeeper also indicates that concrete, particulates of sand, gravel, and cement have been and continue to be tracked from vehicle maintenance and equipment washing areas throughout the Facility. These pollutants accumulate at the sand and gravel storage areas and near the silos, the loading and unloading areas, and the driveways leading onto Construction Circle. As a result, trucks and vehicles leaving the Facility via the driveways are pollutant sources tracking sediment, dirt, oil and gas, metal particles, and other pollutants off site.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that raw materials are stored outside and weighing and mixing activities occur outside without adequate cover or containment resulting in discharges of polluted storm water. Additionally, metal parts and hazardous materials associated with maintenance, fueling, and washing of the concrete trucks occur outside without secondary containment or other measures to prevent polluted storm water and prohibited non-storm water discharges from discharging from the Facility. These activities are all significant pollutant sources at the Facility.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates the Facility Owner and/or Operator has not properly developed and/or implemented the required best management practices ("BMPs") to address the pollutant sources and associated pollutants at the Facility. BMPs are necessary at the Facility to prevent the exposure of pollutants to precipitation and the subsequent discharge of polluted storm water from the Facility during rain events. As a result of the Facility Owner and/or Operator's failure to develop and/or implement adequate BMPs, during rain events storm water carries pollutants from the Facility's stockpile or material storage area(s), truck parking area(s), maintenance area(s), add-mix area(s), batch plant area(s), washing area(s), and other areas into the storm sewer system, which flows into the Receiving Waters, in violation of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act. The Facility Owner and/or Operator's failure to develop and/or implement required BMPs also results in prohibited discharges of non-storm water in violation of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act. Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that process waters discharge from Facility equipment washing and other industrial activity areas.

These illegal discharges of polluted storm and non-storm water negatively impact Waterkeeper's members' use and enjoyment of the Receiving Waters by degrading the quality of the Receiving Waters and by posing risks to human health and aquatic life.

C. Facility Storm Water Flow and Discharge Locations

In the Facility SWPPP, the Facility Owner and/or Operator reports that the Facility consists of two drainage areas: Drainage Area 1 ("DA1") and Drainage Area 2 ("DA2"). DA1 is reportedly located on the west side of the Facility, and storm water on this portion "flows to the recycle ponds where storm water is used in concrete production." Facility SWPPP, Sec. 4.1. The retention capacity of the recycle ponds is not provided. DA2 is reportedly located on the east side of the Facility, and storm water on this portion "flows to the northeast driveway." *Id.*

The Facility Owner and/or Operator states that storm water discharges from the northeast driveway onto Construction Circle East only, and that is where samples are collected. *See id.* Information available to Waterkeeper, including direct observations, indicates that there are at least three (3) additional discharge locations at the Facility: (1) the northwest driveway onto Construction Circle West, (2) the southwest driveway onto Construction Circle West, and (3) the southeast driveway onto Construction Circle East. Thus there are least four (4) discharge locations at the Facility.

Discharges from the Facility flow into the City of Irvine storm drains. After the storm water enters the storm drains it is carried to the Receiving Waters.

III. VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT AND THE STORM WATER PERMIT

In California, any person who discharges storm water associated with industrial activity must comply with the terms of the Storm Water Permit in order to lawfully discharge pollutants. *See* 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311(a), 1342; 40 C.F.R. § 122.26(c)(1); *see also* Storm Water Permit, Fact Sheet at VII.

Between 1997 and June 30, 2015, the Storm Water Permit in effect was Order No. 97-03-DWQ, which Waterkeeper refers to as the "1997 Permit." On July 1, 2015, pursuant to Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ the Storm Water Permit was reissued, and, as explained below, includes terms that are as stringent or more stringent than the 1997 Permit. For purposes of this Notice Letter, Waterkeeper refers to the reissued permit as the "2015 Permit." Accordingly, the Facility Owner and/or Operator is liable for violations of the 1997 Permit and ongoing violations of the 2015 Permit, and civil penalties and injunctive relief are available remedies. *See Illinois v. Outboard Marine, Inc.*, 680 F.2d 473, 480-81 (7th Cir. 1982) (relief granted for violations of an expired permit); *Sierra Club v. Aluminum Co. of Am.*, 585 F. Supp. 842, 853-54 (N.D.N.Y. 1984) (holding that the Clean Water Act's legislative intent and public policy favor allowing penalties for violations of an expired permit); *Pub. Interest Research Group of N.J. v. Carter-Wallace, Inc.*, 684 F. Supp. 115, 121-22 (D.N.J. 1988) ("Limitations of an expired permit, when those

limitations have been transferred unchanged to the newly issued permit, may be viewed as currently in effect”).

A. Unauthorized Non-Storm Water Discharges from the Facility in Violation of Storm Water Permit Discharge Prohibitions

Except as authorized by Special Conditions D(1) of the Storm Water Permit, Discharge Prohibition A(1) prohibits permittees from discharging materials other than storm water (non-storm water discharges) either directly or indirectly to waters of the United States. The 2015 Permit includes the same discharge prohibition. *See* 2015 Permit, Discharge Prohibition III.B. Prohibited non-storm water discharges must be either eliminated or permitted by a separate NPDES permit. *See* Storm Water Permit, Discharge Prohibition A(1); *see also* 2015 Permit, Discharge Prohibition III.B.

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that unauthorized non-storm water discharges occur at the Facility due to inadequate BMP development and/or implementation necessary to prevent these discharges. For example, unauthorized non-storm water discharges occur at the Facility when truck washing and cleaning activities occur. The Facility Owner and/or Operator conducts these activities without BMPs to prevent related non-storm water discharges. Non-storm water discharges resulting from washing and cleaning are not from sources that are listed among the authorized non-storm water discharges in Special Conditions D(1) of the Storm Water Permit and thus are always prohibited under the Storm Water Permit.

Waterkeeper puts the Facility Owner and/or Operator on notice that the Storm Water Discharge Prohibitions are violated each time non-storm water is discharged from the Facility. *See* 1997 Permit, Discharge Prohibition D(1); *see also* 2015 Permit, Discharge Prohibition III.B. These discharge violations are ongoing and will continue until the Facility Owner and/or Operator develops and implements BMPs that prevent prohibited non-storm water discharges, or obtains separate NPDES permit coverage. Each time the Facility Owner and/or Operator discharges prohibited non-storm water in violation of Discharge Prohibition A(1) of the 1997 Permit and Discharge Prohibition III.B. of the 2015 Permit is a separate and distinct violation of the Storm Water Permit and section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a). Waterkeeper will update the number and dates of violations when additional information becomes available. The Facility Owner and/or Operator is subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since March 13, 2012.

B. Discharges of Polluted Storm Water from the Facility in Violation of Storm Water Permit Effluent Limitations

Effluent Limitation B(3) of the 1997 Permit requires dischargers to reduce or prevent pollutants associated with industrial activity in storm water discharges through implementation of BMPs that achieve Best Available Technology Economically Achievable (“BAT”) for toxic⁴

⁴ Toxic pollutants are listed at 40 C.F.R. § 401.15 and include copper, benzene, arsenic, lead, and zinc, among others.

and non-conventional pollutants and Best Conventional Pollutant Control Technology (“BCT”) for conventional pollutants.⁵ The 2015 Permit includes the same effluent limitation. *See* 2015 Permit, Effluent Limitation V.A.

Information available to Waterkeeper, including its review of publicly available information and observations, BMPs that achieve BAT/BCT have not been implemented at the Facility. For example, storm water discharges from the Facility contain concentrations of pollutants associated with the Facility’s industrial activities above benchmark levels established by the EPA. These EPA benchmarks are relevant and objective standards for evaluating whether a permittee’s BMPs achieve compliance with BAT/BCT standards as required by Effluent Limitation B(3) of the 1997 Permit and Effluent Limitation V.A. of the 2015 Permit.⁶ The table in Exhibit 1 sets forth the results of samples collected by Waterkeeper as well as the Facility Owner and/or Operator. The ongoing, repeated and significant exceedances of EPA benchmarks for pH, iron, N+N, and TSS as shown in Exhibit 1 demonstrates that the Facility Owner and/or Operator has failed and continues to fail to develop and/or implement BMPs at the Facility as required to achieve compliance with the BAT/BCT standards.

Waterkeeper puts the Facility Owner and/or Operator on notice that the Storm Water Permit Effluent Limitations are violated each time storm water discharges from the Facility. *See, e.g.,* Exhibit 2 (setting forth dates of rain events resulting in a discharge at the Facility).⁷ These discharge violations are ongoing and will continue every time Cemex discharges polluted storm water from the Facility without developing and/or implementing BMPs that achieve compliance with the BAT/BCT standards. Waterkeeper will update the dates of violations when additional information and data become available. Each time Cemex discharges polluted storm water in violation of Effluent Limitation B(3) of the 1997 Permit and Effluent Limitation V.A. of the 2015 Permit is a separate and distinct violation of the Storm Water Permit and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a). The Facility Owner and/or Operator is subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since March 13, 2012.

Further, Waterkeeper puts the Facility Owner and/or Operator on notice that 2015 Permit Effluent Limitation V.A. is an independent requirement with which Cemex must comply, and that carrying out the iterative process triggered by exceedances of the Numeric Action Levels (“NALs”) listed at Table 2 of the 2015 Permit does not amount to compliance with Effluent Limitation V.A. Exceedances of the NALs demonstrate that a facility (such as the Facility at issue here) is among the worst performing facilities in the State. However, the NALs do not

⁵ Conventional pollutants are listed at 40 C.F.R. § 401.16 and include biochemical oxygen demand, TSS, oil and grease, pH, and fecal coliform.

⁶ *See United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Multi-Sector General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity (MSGP) Authorization to Discharge Under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System*, as modified effective February 26, 2009 (“Multi-Sector Permit”), Fact Sheet at 106; *see also*, 65 Federal Register 64839 (2000).

⁷ Dates of significant rain events are measured at the Santa Ana rain gauge operated by the Orange County Flood Control District. A significant rain event is defined by EPA as a rainfall event generating 0.1 inches or more of rainfall, which generally results in discharges at a typical industrial facility.

represent technology-based criteria relevant to determining whether an industrial facility has implemented BMPs that achieve BAT/BCT. And even if the Facility Owner and/or Operator submits any Exceedance Response Action Plan(s) pursuant to Section XII. of the 2015 Permit, the violations of Effluent Limitation V.A. described in this Notice Letter are ongoing.

C. Discharges of Polluted Storm Water from the Facility in Violation of Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations

Receiving Water Limitation C(2) of the 1997 Permit prohibits storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges that cause or contribute to an exceedance of an applicable Water Quality Standard ("WQS").⁸ The 2015 Permit includes the same receiving water limitation. *See* 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.A. Discharges that contain pollutants in excess of applicable WQS violate the Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation C(2); 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.A.

Receiving Water Limitation C(1) of the 1997 Permit prohibits storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges to surface water that adversely impact human health or the environment. The 2015 Permit includes the same receiving water limitation. *See* 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.B. Discharges that contain pollutants in concentrations that exceed levels known to adversely impact aquatic species and the environment constitute violations of the Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation C(1); 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.B.

Storm water sampling at the Facility demonstrates that discharges contain concentrations of pollutants that cause or contribute to a violation of an applicable WQS. For example, the WQS from the Basin Plan for pH is 6.5-8.5 s.u. On April 5, 2006, storm water discharging from the Facility measured a pH level of 9.25 s.u., 0.75 s.u. above the maximum allowable pH—nearly one order of magnitude above the maximum pH WQS. *See* Ex. 1. The levels of pH remain high in storm water discharging from the Facility; on November 4, 2011, storm water discharging from the Facility measured a pH level of 9.26 s.u., 0.76 s.u. above the maximum allowable pH—again nearly one order of magnitude above the maximum pH WQS.

As explained herein, the Receiving Waters are impaired, and thus unable to support the designated beneficial uses, for some of the same pollutants discharging from the Facility. The 2012 303(d) List of Impaired Water Bodies lists the Receiving Waters as impaired for multiple pollutants, including pH. Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that the Facility's storm water discharges contain elevated concentrations of pollutants, such as iron and pH, which can

⁸ The Basin Plan designates Beneficial Uses for the Receiving Waters. Water quality standards are pollutant concentration levels determined by the state or federal agencies to be protective of designated Beneficial Uses. Discharges above water quality standards contribute to impairment of Receiving Waters' Beneficial Uses. Applicable water quality standards include, among others, the Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants in the State of California, 40 C.F.R. § 131.38 ("CTR"), and water quality objectives in the Basin Plan. Industrial storm water discharges must strictly comply with water quality standards, including those criteria listed in the applicable basin plan. *See Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner*, 191 F.3d 1159, 1166-67 (9th Cir. 1999).

be acutely toxic and/or have sub-lethal impacts on the avian and aquatic wildlife in the Receiving Waters. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit 1. In particular, storm water discharged with high pH can damage the gills and skin of aquatic organisms and cause death at levels above 10 standard units. The pH scale is logarithmic and the solubility of a substance varies as a function of the pH of a solution. A one whole unit change in SU represents a tenfold increase or decrease in ion concentration. If the pH of water is too high or too low, the aquatic organisms living within it will become stressed or die. Discharges of elevated concentrations of pollutants in the storm water from the Facility also adversely impact human health. These harmful discharges from the Facility are violations of the Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation C(1); 2015 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.

Waterkeeper puts the Facility Owner and/or Operator on notice that Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations are violated each time polluted storm water discharges from the Facility. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit 2. These discharge violations are ongoing and will continue every time contaminated storm water is discharged in violation of the Storm Water Permit Receiving Water Limitations. Each time discharges of storm water from the Facility cause or contribute to a violation of an applicable WQS, it is a separate and distinct violation of Receiving Water Limitation C(2) of the 1997 Permit, Receiving Water Limitation VI.A. of the 2015 permit, and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1311(a). Waterkeeper will update the dates of violation when additional information and data becomes available. The Facility Owner and/or Operator is subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since March 13, 2012.

Further, Waterkeeper puts the Facility Owner and/or Operator on notice that 2015 Permit Receiving Water Limitations are independent Permit requirements with which Cemex must comply, and that carrying out the iterative process triggered by exceedances of the NALs listed at Table 2 of the 2015 Permit does not amount to compliance with the Receiving Water Limitations. The NALs do not represent water quality based criteria relevant to determining whether an industrial facility has caused or contributed to an exceedance of a water quality standard.⁹ Even if the Facility Owner and/or Operator submits any Exceedance Response Action Plan(s) pursuant to Section XII. Of the 2015 Permit, the violations of the Receiving Water Limitations described in this Notice Letter are ongoing.

D. Failure to Develop, Implement, and/or Revise an Adequate Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan

The Storm Water Permit Requires permittees to develop and implement Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans prior to conducting, and in order to continue, industrial activities. The specific SWPPP requirements of the 1997 Permit and the 2015 Permit are set out below.

⁹ “The NALs are not intended to serve as technology-based or water quality-based numeric effluent limitations. The NALs are not derived directly from either BAT/BCT requirements or receiving water objectives. NAL exceedances defined in [the 2015] Permit are not, in and of themselves, violations of [the 2015] Permit.” 2015 Permit, Finding 63, p. 11. The NALs do, however, trigger reporting requirements. *See* 2015 Permit, Section XII.

1. 1997 Permit SWPPP Requirements

Section A(1) and Provision E(2) of the 1997 Permit require dischargers to have developed and implemented a SWPPP by October 1, 1992, or prior to beginning industrial activities, that meets all of the requirements of the Storm Water Permit. The objectives of the 1997 Permit SWPPP requirement are to identify and evaluate sources of pollutants associated with industrial activities that may affect the quality of storm water discharges from the Facility and to implement site-specific BMPs to reduce or prevent pollutants associated with industrial activities in storm water discharges. *See* 1997 Permit, Section A(2). These BMPs must achieve compliance with the Storm Water Permit's Effluent Limitations and Receiving Water Limitations.

To ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit, the SWPPP must be evaluated on an annual basis pursuant to the requirements of Section A(9) of the 1997 Permit, and must be revised as necessary to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit. 1997 Permit, Sections A(9) and (10). Sections A(3) – A(10) of the 1997 Permit set forth the requirements for a SWPPP. Among other requirements, the SWPPP must include: a site map showing the facility boundaries, storm water drainage areas with flow patterns, nearby water bodies, the location of the storm water collection, conveyance and discharge system, structural control measures, areas of actual and potential pollutant contact, areas of industrial activity, and other features of the facility and its industrial activities (see 1997 Permit, Section A(4)); a list of significant materials handled and stored at the site (see 1997 Permit, Section A(5)); a description of potential pollutant sources, including industrial processes, material handling and storage areas, dust and particulate generating activities, significant spills and leaks, non-storm water discharges and their sources, and locations where soil erosion may occur (see 1997 Permit, Section A(6)).

Sections A(7) and A(8) of the 1997 Permit require an assessment of potential pollutant sources at the facility and description of the BMPs to be implemented at the facility that will reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges, including structural BMPs where non-structural BMPs are not effective.

2. 2015 Permit SWPPP Requirements

As with the SWPPP requirements of the 1997 Permit, Sections X(A) - (H) of the 2015 Permit require dischargers to have developed and implemented a SWPPP that meets all of the requirements of the 2015 Permit. *See also* 2015 Permit, Appendix 1. The objective of the SWPPP requirements are still to identify and evaluate sources of pollutants associated with industrial activities that may affect the quality of storm water discharges, and to implement site-specific BMPs to reduce or prevent pollutants associated with industrial activities in storm water discharges. *See* 2015 Permit, Section X(C).

The SWPPP must include, among other things and consistent with the 1997 Permit, a narrative description and summary of all industrial activity, potential sources of pollutants, and potential pollutants; a site map indicating the storm water conveyance system, associated points of discharge, direction of flow, areas of actual and potential pollutant contact, including the

extent of pollution-generating activities, nearby water bodies, and pollutant control measures; a description of the BMPs developed and implemented to reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges and authorized non-storm water discharges necessary to comply with the Storm Water Permit; the identification and elimination of non-storm water discharges; the location where significant materials are being shipped, stored, received, and handled, as well as the typical quantities of such materials and the frequency with which they are handled; a description of dust and particulate-generating activities, and; the identification of individuals and their current responsibilities for developing and implementing the SWPPP. 2015 Permit, Section X(A)-(H).

Further, the 2015 Permit requires the discharger to evaluate the SWPPP on an annual basis and revise it as necessary to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit. 2015 Permit, Section X(A)-(B). Like the 1997 Permit, the 2015 Permit also requires that the discharger conduct an annual comprehensive site compliance evaluation that includes a review of all visual observation records, inspection reports and sampling and analysis results, a visual inspection of all potential pollutant sources for evidence of, or the potential for, pollutants entering the drainage system, a review and evaluation of all BMPs to determine whether the BMPs are adequate, properly implemented and maintained, or whether additional BMPs are needed, and a visual inspection of equipment needed to implement the SWPPP. 2015 Permit, Section X(B) and Section XV.

3. The Facility Owner and/or Operator Has Violated and Continues to Violate the Storm Water Permit SWPPP Requirements

Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that the Facility Owner and/or Operator has been and continues to conduct operations at the Facility with an inadequately developed and/or implemented SWPPP. For example, site map included in the SWPPP dated May 2015 fails to include: a depiction of all the discharge locations at the Facility, the location of the storm water collection system and municipal storm drains that receive the Facility's storm water discharges, locations and descriptions of structural control measures, e.g., recycle ponds reportedly related to the truck wash, areas of actual and potential pollutant contact, including the extent of pollution-generating activities, or areas of industrial activity including shipping and receiving areas and dust or particulate generating areas.

Further, the SWPPP fails to identify all significant materials and potential pollutants at the Facility and BMPs that prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants at the Facility achievable through implementation of BAT/BCT. For example, in its assessment of pollutant sources the Facility Owner and/or Operator identifies fine cement dust as a source for pH and iron that is "difficult to sweep up [] at a level that does not adversely impact storm water." However, the Facility Owner and/or Operator has failed and continues to fails to adequately develop and implement BMPs via the SWPPP to address this assessed pollutant source. *See* Ex. 1 (demonstrating high pH levels and high concentrations of iron). As stated above, San Diego Creek is listed as impaired for pH—the very pollutant the Facility Owner and/or Operator has failed to address.

Nor has the Facility Owner and/or Operator adequately revised the SWPPP in response to ongoing high concentrations of pollutants in storm water discharges. Lastly, the SWPPP does not include information required by Section X(H)(6) such as the installation date and the design storm standard, related to detention basins the Facility Owner and/or Operator report are “advanced BMPs” at the Facility.

Accordingly, the Facility Owner and/or Operator has failed and continues to fail to adequately develop, implement, and/or revise a SWPPP, in violation of SWPPP requirements of the Storm Water Permit. Every day the Facility operates with an inadequately developed, implemented, and/or properly revised SWPPP is a separate and distinct violation of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act. The Facility Owner and/or Operator has been in daily and continuous violation of the Storm Water Permit SWPPP requirements since at least March 13, 2012. These violations are ongoing, and Waterkeeper will include additional violations when information becomes available. The Facility Owner and/or Operator is subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since March 13, 2012.

E. Failure to Develop, Implement, and/or Revise an Adequate Monitoring and Reporting Program

The Storm Water Permit requires permittees to develop and implement storm water monitoring and reporting programs (“M&RPs”) prior to conducting, and in order to continue, industrial activities. The specific M&RP requirements of the 1997 and 2015 Permit are set out below.

1. 1997 Permit M&RP Requirements

Section B(1) and Provision E(3) of the 1997 Permit require facility operators to develop and implement an adequate M&RP by October 1, 1992, or prior to the commencement of industrial activities at a facility, that meets all of the requirements of the Storm Water Permit. The primary objective of the M&RP is to detect and measure the concentrations of pollutants in a facility’s discharge to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit’s Discharge Prohibitions, Effluent Limitations, and Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 1997 Permit, Section B(2).

The M&RP must therefore ensure that BMPs are effectively reducing and/or eliminating pollutants at the facility, and must be evaluated and revised whenever appropriate to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit. *Id.* Sections B(3) – B(16) of the 1997 Permit set forth the M&RP requirements. Specifically, Section B(3) requires dischargers to conduct quarterly visual observations of all drainage areas within their facility for the presence of authorized and unauthorized non-storm water discharges. Section B(4) requires dischargers to conduct visual observations of storm water discharges from one storm event per month during the Wet Season. Sections B(3) and B(4) further require dischargers to document the presence of any floating or suspended material, oil and grease, discolorations, turbidity, odor, and the source of any pollutants. Dischargers must maintain records of observations, observation dates, locations

observed, and responses taken to eliminate unauthorized non-storm water discharges and to reduce or prevent pollutants from contacting non-storm water and storm water discharges. *See* 1997 Permit, Sections B(3) and B(4). Dischargers must revise the SWPPP in response to these observations to ensure that BMPs are effectively reducing and/or eliminating pollutants at the facility. *Id.*, Section B(4). Sections B(5) and B(7) of the 1997 Permit require dischargers to visually observe and collect samples of storm water from all locations where storm water is discharged.

The Facility was and/or is a member of the Building Materials Industry Group Monitoring Program, and thus the Facility Owner and/or Operator must comply with the group monitoring provisions set forth in Section B(15) of the 1997 Permit. Under Section B(15) of the 1997 Permit, the Facility Owner and/or Operators must collect at least two (2) samples from each discharge point at the Facility over a five (5) year period. *See* 1997 Permit, Sections B(5), B(7), and B(15). Storm water samples must be analyzed for TSS, pH, specific conductance ("SC"), total organic carbon or O&G, and other pollutants that are likely to be present in the facility's discharges in significant quantities, such as aluminum and nitrate plus nitrite. *See* Storm Water Permit, Section B(5)(c). The 1997 Permit requires facilities classified as SIC code 3273, such as the Facility, to also analyze storm water samples for iron. *See* 1997 Permit, Table D, Sector E.

2. 2015 Permit M&RP Requirements

As with the 1997 M&RP requirements, Sections X(I) and XI(A)-XI(D) of the 2015 Permit require facility operators to develop and implement an adequate M&RP that meets all of the requirements of the 2015 Permit. The objective of the M&RP is still to detect and measure the concentrations of pollutants in a facility's discharge, and to ensure compliance with the 2015 Permit's Discharge Prohibitions, Effluent Limitations, and Receiving Water Limitations. *See* 2015 Permit, Section XI. An adequate M&RP ensures that BMPs are effectively reducing and/or eliminating pollutants at the facility, and is evaluated and revised whenever appropriate to ensure compliance with the Storm Water Permit. *See id.*

As an *increase* in observation frequency over the 1997 Permit, Section XI(A) of the 2015 Permit requires all visual observations at least once each month, and at the same time sampling occurs at a discharge location. Observations must document the presence of any floating and suspended material, O&G, discolorations, turbidity, odor and the source of any pollutants. 2015 Permit, Section XI(A)(2). Dischargers must document and maintain records of observations, observation dates, locations observed, and responses taken to reduce or prevent pollutants in storm water discharges. 2015 Permit, Section XI(A)(3).

As an *increase* in sampling frequency, Section XI(B)(1-5) of the 2015 Permit requires permittees participating in a group monitoring plan, such as the Facility Owner and/or Operator,

to collect storm water discharge samples from a qualifying storm event¹⁰ as follows: 1) from each discharge location, 2) from one storm event within the first half of each reporting year¹¹ (July 1 to December 31), 3) from one storm event within the second half of each reporting year (January 1 to June 30), and 4) within four hours of the start of a discharge, or the start of facility operations if the qualifying storm event occurs within the previous 12-hour period. Section XI(B)(11) of the 2015 Permit, among other requirements, provides that permittees must submit all sampling and analytical results for all samples via SMARTS within 30 days of obtaining all results for each sampling event.

The parameters to be analyzed are also consistent with the 1997 Permit. Specifically, Section XI(B)(6)(a)-(b) of the 2015 Permit requires permittees to analyze samples for TSS, oil & grease, and pH. In addition, Table 1 of the 2015 Permit requires SIC code 3273 facilities, such as this Facility, to analyze samples for iron. Section XI(B)(6)(c) of the 2015 Permit requires permittees to analyze samples for pollutants associated with industrial operations. Section XI(B)(6) of the 2015 Permit also requires dischargers to analyze storm water samples for additional applicable industrial parameters related to receiving waters with 303(d) listed impairments, or approved Total Maximum Daily Loads.

3. The Facility Owner and/or Operator Has Violated and Continue to Violate the Storm Water Permit M&RP Requirements

The Facility Owner and/or Operator has been and continues to conduct operations at the Facility with an inadequately developed, implemented, and/or revised M&RP. For example, the Facility Owner and/or Operator has failed and continues to fail to conduct all required quarterly and/or monthly visual observations of unauthorized discharges. *See* 1997 Permit, Section B(3); *see also* 2015 Permit, Section XI(A)(1). Additionally, the Facility Owner and/or Operator has failed to conduct, and/or provide the records required by the Storm Water Permit for, the monthly visual observations of storm water discharges in violation of Section B(4) of the 1997 Permit and Section XI(A)(3) of the 2015 Permit.

The Facility Owner and/or Operator has also failed and continues to fail to develop an M&RP that requires the Facility Owner and/or Operator to analyze storm water discharges from the Facility for all required parameters by failing to specify that storm water discharges will be analyzed for, at a minimum, aluminum, COD, BOD, N+N, and zinc, in violation of Section B(5)(c) of the 1997 Permit and Section XI(B)(6) of the 2015 Permit. With respect to N+N in the 2015-2016 Annual Report, the Facility Owner and/or Operator identifies that the Receiving Waters are impaired for "Nitrate, Nitrite, total Nitrogen," but asserts that those pollutants are not associated with the industrial activities at the Facility. However, the Facility Owner and/or Operator has reported concentrations of N+N above EPA benchmarks indicating that nitrite and nitrate are present in storm water discharges from the Facility in significant quantities.

¹⁰ The 2015 Permit defines a qualifying storm event as one that produces a discharge for at least one drainage area, and is preceded by 48-hours with no discharge from any drainage areas. 2015 Permit, Section XI(B)(1).

¹¹ A reporting year is defined as July 1 through June 30. 2015 Permit, Findings, ¶ 62(b).

In addition, the Facility Owner and/or Operator has failed and continues to fail to develop and M&RP that requires the Facility Owner and/or Operator to collect storm water samples from all discharge locations at the Facility from all storm water discharges occurring during qualifying storm events. While Section B(7)(d) of the 1997 Permit and Section XI(C)(4) of the 2015 Permit allow permittees to reduce the number of locations to be sampled, there is no indication in the Facility storm water reports, e.g., SWPPP or M&RP, that the Facility Owner and/or Operator has complied with the requirements of Section B(7)(d) of the 1997 Permit or Section XI(C)(4) to justify sampling a reduced number of discharge locations at the Facility. Nor has the Facility Owner and/or Operator collected storm water discharges as requires, and as described in more detail below.

Accordingly, the Facility Owner and/or Operator has failed and continues to fail to adequately develop, implement, and/or revise a M&RP, in violation of M&RP requirements of the Storm Water Permit. Every day the Facility operates with an inadequately developed, implemented, and/or properly revised M&RP is a separate and distinct violation of the Storm Water Permit and the Clean Water Act. The Facility Owner and/or Operator has been in daily and continuous violation of the Storm Water Permit M&RP requirements since at least March 13, 2012. These violations are ongoing, and Waterkeeper will include additional violations when information becomes available. The Facility Owner and/or Operator is subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since March 13, 2012.

F. Failure to Comply with the Storm Water Permit's Reporting Requirements

Section B(14) of the 1997 Permit requires a permittee to submit an Annual Report to the Regional Board by July 1 of each year. Section B(14) requires that the Annual Report include a summary of visual observations and sampling results, an evaluation of the visual observation and sampling results, the laboratory reports of sample analysis, the annual comprehensive site compliance evaluation report, an explanation of why a permittee did not implement any activities required, and other information specified in Section B(13). The 2015 Permit includes the same annual reporting requirement. *See* 2015 Permit, Section XVI.

The Facility Owner and/or Operator has failed and continues to fail to submit Annual Reports that comply with these reporting requirements. For example, in each Annual Report since the filing of the 2011-2012 Annual Report, the Facility Owner and/or Operator certified that: (1) a complete Annual Comprehensive Site Compliance Evaluation was done pursuant to Section A(9) of the Storm Water Permit; (2) the SWPPP's BMPs address existing potential pollutant sources; and (3) the SWPPP complies with the Storm Water Permit, or will otherwise be revised to achieve compliance. However, information available to Waterkeeper indicates that these certifications are erroneous. For example, as discussed above, storm water samples collected from the Facility contain concentrations of pollutants above EPA benchmarks, thus demonstrating that the Facility BMPs do not adequately address existing potential pollutant sources. Further, the Facility's SWPPP does not include many elements required by the Storm Water Permit, and thus it is erroneous to certify that the SWPPP complies with the Storm Water Permit.

The Facility Owners and/or Operators have also submitted incomplete Annual Reports. The 2012-2013 Annual Report failed to include a signature certifying the report and information relating to non-storm water and storm water visual observations, as required.

In addition, the facility operator must report any noncompliance with the Storm Water Permit at the time that the Annual Report is submitted, including: 1) a description of the noncompliance and its cause; 2) the period of noncompliance; 3) if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and 4) steps taken or planned to reduce and prevent recurrence of the noncompliance. Storm Water Permit, Section C(11)(d). The Facility Owner and/or Operator has not accurately reported non-compliance, as required. Rather, for example, as reported in the 2013-2014 Annual Report, the Facility Owner and/or Operator did not conduct any monthly wet weather visual observations or collect any storm water samples because “this site did not have a qualifying storm event that produced a discharge within the first hour.” As reported in the 2015-2016 Annual Report the Facility Owner and/or Operator failed to collect any storm water samples because “no qualifying Storm Water discharges occurred during scheduled facility operating hours.” The “reasons” provided do not justify the Facility Owner and/or Operator’s failure to conduct required observations and collect samples, however. Information available to Waterkeeper indicates that there was at least twelve (12) qualifying storm events during Facility operating hours¹² during the 2013-2014 reporting year and at least nine (9) qualifying storm events during Facility operating hours during the 2015-2015 reporting year.¹³ Based on publicly available data, the Facility Owner and/or Operator has failed to collect required storm water samples since November 4, 2011.

Given that the Facility Owner and/or Operator has submitted incomplete and/or incorrect Annual Reports that fail to comply with the Storm Water Permit, the Facility Owner and/or Operator is in daily violation of the Storm Water Permit. Every day the Facility Owner and/or Operator conducts operations at the Facility without reporting as required by the Storm Water Permit is a separate and distinct violation of the Storm Water Permit and Section 301(a) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. §1311(a). The Facility Owner and/or Operator has been in daily and continuous violation of the Storm Water Permit’s reporting requirements every day since at least March 13, 2012. These violations are ongoing, and Waterkeeper will include additional violations when information becomes available. The Facility Owner and/or Operator is subject to civil penalties for all violations of the Clean Water Act occurring since March 13, 2012.

¹² The SWPPP states that the Facility operating hours are: “Monday – Friday...9 to 15 hours per day, Saturday...8 to 12 hours, (Sunday for specific jobs only).”

¹³ For example, as is shown in Exhibit 2 it rained 0.24 inches on Thursday, October 10, 2013, and on September 15, 2015, it rained 1.27 inches. Waterkeeper collected storm water samples from the Facility during a rain event of 0.17 inches on Thursday, January 5, 2017. Accordingly, it is likely that the rain events on Thursday, October 10, 2013 and Tuesday, September 15, 2015, produced a discharge from the Facility.

IV. RELIEF SOUGHT FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT

Pursuant to Section 309(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1319(d), and the Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation, 40 C.F.R. § 19.4, each separate violation of the Clean Water Act subjects the violator to a penalty for all violations occurring during the period commencing five years prior to the date of the Notice Letter. These provisions of law authorize civil penalties of \$37,500.00 per day per violation for all Clean Water Act violations after January 12, 2009 and \$51,570.00 per day per violation for violations that occurred after November 2, 2015.

In addition to civil penalties, Coastkeeper will seek injunctive relief preventing further violations of the Clean Water Act pursuant to Sections 505(a) and (d), 33 U.S.C. § 1365(a) and (d), declaratory relief, and such other relief as permitted by law.

Lastly, pursuant to Section 505(d) of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. § 1365(d), Coastkeeper will seek to recover its costs, including attorneys' and experts' fees, associated with this enforcement action.

V. CONCLUSION

Waterkeeper is willing to discuss effective remedies for the violations described in this Notice Letter. However, upon expiration of the 60-day notice period, Waterkeeper will file a citizen suit under Section 505(a) of the Clean Water Act for Davis Wire's violations of the Storm Water Permit.

If you wish to pursue settlement discussions please contact Waterkeeper's legal counsel:

Drevet Hunt
Caroline Koch
Lawyers for Clean Water, Inc.
1004A O'Reilly Avenue
San Francisco, California 94129
Tel: (415) 440-6520

Sincerely,



Bruce Reznik
Executive Director
Los Angeles Waterkeeper



Garry Brown
Executive Director
Orange County Coastkeeper
Inland Empire Waterkeeper

SERVICE LIST

VIA U.S. MAIL

Jeffrey Sessions, Attorney General
U.S. Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Alexis Strauss
Acting Regional Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, California 94105

Kurt Berchtold
Executive Officer
Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
3737 Main Street, Suite 500
Riverside, California 92501

Scott Pruitt
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
William Jefferson Clinton Building
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Thomas Howard
Executive Director
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, California 95812

Sample collected by Waterkeeper (W) or Discharger (D)	Date of sample collection	Sample Location	Parameter	Result	Units	Benchmark	Magnitude of Benchmark Exceedance	California Toxics Rule Criteria/WQO	Magnitude of CTR/WQO Exceedance
D	4/5/06 0:00	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Electrical Conductivity @ 25 Deg. C	174	umhos/cm	200	0.87	none	n/a
D	4/5/06 0:00	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Iron, Total	1510	ug/L	100	15.1	none	n/a
D	4/5/06 0:00	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Nitrite Plus Nitrate (as N)	1.01	mg/L	0.68	1.485294118	none	n/a
D	4/5/06 0:00	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Oil and Grease	28	mg/L	15	1.866666667	none	n/a
D	4/5/06 0:00	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	114	mg/L	100	1.14	none	n/a
D	4/5/06 0:00	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	pH	9.25	SU	6.0-9.0	0.25	6.5-8.5	0.75
D	1/19/10 14:00	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Electrical Conductivity @ 25 Deg. C	52.7	umhos/cm	200	0.2635	none	n/a
D	1/19/10 14:00	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Iron, Total	522	ug/L	100	5.22	none	n/a
D	1/19/10 14:00	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Nitrite Plus Nitrate (as N)	0.321	mg/L	0.68	0.472058824	none	n/a
D	1/19/10 14:00	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Oil and Grease	14.3	mg/L	15	0.953333333	none	n/a
D	1/19/10 14:00	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	122	mg/L	100	1.22	none	n/a
D	1/19/10 14:00	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	pH	8.31	SU	6.0-9.0	n/a	6.5-8.5	n/a
No samples collected									
D	11/4/11 11:30	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Electrical Conductivity @ 25 Deg. C	181	umhos/cm	200	0.905	none	n/a
D	11/4/11 11:30	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Iron, Total	0.845	mg/L	100	0.00845	none	n/a
D	11/4/11 11:30	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Nitrite Plus Nitrate (as N)	1.19	mg/L	0.68	1.75	none	n/a
D	11/4/11 11:30	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Oil and Grease	4.72	mg/L	15	0.314666667	none	n/a
D	11/4/11 11:30	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	29	mg/L	100	0.29	none	n/a
D	11/4/11 11:30	Northeast Driveway onto Construction Cir. East	pH	9.26	SU	6.0-9.0	0.26	6.5-8.5	0.76
No samples collected									
No samples collected									
No samples collected									
W	11/20/16 11:53	Entrance Driveway	Nitrite Plus Nitrate (as N)	0.31	mg/L	0.68	0.455882353	none	n/a
W	11/20/16 11:53	Entrance Driveway	Aluminum	1400	ug/L	750	1.866666667	none	n/a
W	11/20/16 11:53	Entrance Driveway	Copper	9.6	ug/L	25.3	0.37944664	26	n/a
W	11/20/16 11:53	Entrance Driveway	Iron, Total	1900	ug/L	100	19	none	n/a
W	11/20/16 11:53	Entrance Driveway	Lead	1.7	ug/L	182	0.009340659	194	n/a
W	11/20/16 11:53	Entrance Driveway	Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	37	mg/L	100	0.37	none	n/a
W	11/20/16 11:53	Entrance Driveway	Chemical Oxygen Demand	34	mg/L	120	0.283333333	90	0.377777778
W	11/20/16 11:53	Entrance Driveway	pH	8.1	SU	6.0-9.0	n/a	6.5-8.5	n/a
W	11/20/16 11:53	Entrance Driveway	Biochemical Oxygen Demand	5.8	mg/L	30	0.193333333	none	n/a
W	11/20/16 11:53	Entrance Driveway	Zinc	80	ug/L	200	0.4	213	0.375586854

Sample collected by Waterkeeper (W) or Discharger (D)	Date of sample collection	Sample Location	Parameter	Result	Units	Benchmark	Magnitude of Benchmark Exceedance	California Toxics Rule Criteria/WQO	Magnitude of CTR/WQO Exceedance
W	1/5/17	Entrance Driveway	pH	8.95	SU	6.0-9.0	n/a	6.5-8.5	0.45
W	1/5/17	Entrance Driveway	Nitrite Plus Nitrate (as N)	0.6	mg/L	0.68	0.882352941	none	n/a
W	1/5/17	Entrance Driveway	Aluminum	2.9	mg/L	0.75	3.866666667	none	n/a
W	1/5/17	Entrance Driveway	Copper	0.014	mg/L	0.0253	0.553359684	0.026	0.538461538
W	1/5/17	Entrance Driveway	Lead	0.0055	mg/L	0.182	0.03021978	0.194	0.028350515
W	1/5/17	Entrance Driveway	Iron, Total	3.6	mg/L	1	3.6	none	n/a
W	1/5/17	Entrance Driveway	Zinc	0.14	mg/L	0.2	0.7	0.213	0.657276995
W	1/5/17	Entrance Driveway	Oil and Grease	2.1	mg/L	15	0.14	none	n/a
W	1/5/17	Entrance Driveway	Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	50	mg/L	100	0.5	none	n/a
W	1/5/17	Entrance Driveway	Chemical Oxygen Demand	26	mg/L	120	0.216666667	90	0.288888889
W	1/5/17	Entrance Driveway	Biochemical Oxygen Demand	8	mg/L	30	0.266666667	none	n/a
						Total Exceedances	13		3

Date	Day of Week	Rain Inches
1/21/12	Saturday	0.64
1/22/12	Sunday	0.21
1/24/12	Tuesday	0.51
2/16/12	Thursday	0.45
2/28/12	Tuesday	0.14
3/18/12	Sunday	1.05
3/26/12	Monday	0.67
4/11/12	Wednesday	0.39
4/14/12	Saturday	0.7
4/26/12	Thursday	0.26
7/13/12	Friday	0.18
10/11/12	Thursday	0.18
10/12/12	Friday	0.17
11/17/12	Saturday	0.24
11/29/12	Thursday	0.21
11/30/12	Friday	0.1
12/3/12	Monday	0.6
12/13/12	Thursday	0.54
12/24/12	Monday	0.55
12/26/12	Wednesday	0.26
12/30/12	Sunday	0.13

Date	Day of Week	Rain Inches
1/24/13	Thursday	0.56
1/25/13	Friday	0.3
1/26/13	Saturday	0.22
2/9/13	Saturday	0.18
2/20/13	Wednesday	0.18
3/8/13	Friday	0.27
3/9/13	Saturday	0.12
5/6/13	Monday	0.35
5/7/13	Tuesday	0.19
10/10/13	Thursday	0.24
11/21/13	Thursday	0.32
11/30/13	Saturday	0.22
12/8/13	Sunday	0.27
12/20/13	Friday	0.16
2/3/14	Monday	0.12
2/7/14	Friday	0.11
2/27/14	Thursday	0.44
2/28/14	Friday	0.5
3/1/14	Saturday	1.07
3/2/14	Sunday	0.33
4/2/14	Wednesday	0.12

Date	Day of Week	Rain Inches
4/26/14	Saturday	0.22
11/1/14	Saturday	0.32
12/1/14	Monday	0.13
12/3/14	Wednesday	1.05
12/4/14	Thursday	0.8
12/12/14	Friday	1.32
12/13/14	Saturday	0.69
12/17/14	Wednesday	0.34
12/31/14	Wednesday	0.12
1/11/15	Sunday	0.3
1/12/15	Monday	0.75
1/27/15	Tuesday	0.12
2/23/15	Monday	0.52
3/2/15	Monday	0.19
3/3/15	Tuesday	0.19
4/8/15	Wednesday	0.2
5/8/15	Friday	0.29
5/15/15	Friday	1.06
5/16/15	Saturday	0.16
7/19/15	Sunday	0.19
7/20/15	Monday	0.25

Date	Day of Week	Rain Inches
9/10/15	Thursday	0.16
9/15/15	Tuesday	1.27
12/14/15	Monday	0.2
12/20/15	Sunday	0.14
12/22/15	Tuesday	0.27
12/23/15	Wednesday	0.27
1/6/16	Wednesday	0.97
1/7/16	Thursday	1.56
2/1/16	Monday	0.21
2/18/16	Thursday	0.43
3/6/16	Sunday	0.37
3/7/16	Monday	0.2
3/12/16	Saturday	0.44
5/7/16	Saturday	0.62
10/17/16	Monday	0.17
10/24/16	Monday	0.32
10/25/16	Tuesday	0.1
11/21/16	Monday	0.87
11/27/16	Sunday	0.5
12/16/16	Friday	1.56
12/22/16	Thursday	1.16

Date	Day of Week	Rain Inches
12/23/16	Friday	0.29
12/24/16	Saturday	1.15
12/31/16	Saturday	0.86
1/1/17	Sunday	0.27
1/5/17	Thursday	0.17
1/6/17	Friday	0.15
1/9/17	Monday	0.46
1/11/17	Wednesday	0.37
1/13/17	Friday	1.71
1/16/17	Monday	1.56
1/22/17	Sunday	1.16
1/23/17	Monday	0.29
1/24/17	Tuesday	1.15
1/31/17	Tuesday	0.86
2/6/17	Monday	0.44
2/7/17	Tuesday	0.75
2/8/17	Wednesday	0.12
2/11/17	Saturday	0.29
2/18/17	Saturday	1.42
	Total Rain Days	103

Drevet Hunt
Lawyers for Clean Water, Inc.
1004 O'Reilly Avenue
San Francisco, California 94129

PLACE THIS LABEL TO THE LEFT OF THE POSTAGE

Delivery
17

INSPECTED 8

DEPT. OF JUSTICE - ENRD
ENVIRONMENT DIVISION

17 MAR 28 PM 11:16

Jeffrey Sessions, Attorney General
U.S. Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

X-RAYED

MAR 21 2017

DOJ MAILROOM

